



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PL  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,106	06/24/2003	Michael Howard West		9926
7590	05/23/2005		EXAMINER	
MICHAEL HOWARD WEST 54 SOUTH CROCKETT ROAD SENATOBIA, MS 38668			CLARDY, S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/602,106	WEST, MICHAEL HOWARD
	Examiner S. Mark Clardy	Art Unit 1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
      1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
      3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application.

Applicant's claims are drawn to pest control compositions comprising:

- a) boric acid (0.05 – 75%)
- b) dispersant (0.05 – 75%)
- c) organic pesticide (0.01 – 25%)

claims 2-3: chlorothalonil, propiconazole

The dispersant is an aqueous combination of a metal salt (Al, Co, Fe, Mn, Ni, Ag) and fatty amine. The metal salt may be aluminum nitrate (claim 4); and the fatty amine may be dimethylcocoamine (claim 5).

The rejection under 35 USC 112 is withdrawn in response to applicant's amendment.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Schubert et al (US 5,612,094), Joseph et al (US 5,468,715), Tvedten (US 6,663,860), and McConnell (US 4,132,780).

Schubert et al, again, teach compositions for preserving wood products comprising zirconium salts and boron containing components such as boric acid (col 2, lines 39-62) which are useful for preventing fungal attack.

Joseph et al, again, teach blended fungicidal compositions comprising known fungicidal agents such as propiconazole or chlorothalonil, among others (col 3, lines 25-46), and surfactants

such as cetyltrimethylammonium bromide or condensation products of ethylene oxide with fatty alcohols or amines (col 4, lines 1-8). The discussed prior art also discloses fungicidal compositions comprising boric acid (col 1, lines 65-67).

Tvedten, again, teaches biological pesticides comprising detergents and detergent builders such as sodium borate (col 3, lines 59-63), other additives such as borax (col 5, lines 35-37), and aluminum compounds such as aluminum nitrate (col 5, lines 49-61)

McConnell, again, teaches compositions for the control of fungi and nematodes comprising azides and metal salts including salts of aluminum, cobalt, iron, manganese, nickel, and zirconium (columns 2-4).

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine these references because they disclose various active agents which are useful in fungicidal compositions.

Again, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to have combined applicant's boric acid, dispersant (metal salt and fatty amine), and organic pesticide in a fungicidal composition because the prior art teaches that each of these components was known to have utility in fungicidal compositions. It is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition that is to be used for the very same purpose; the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art. In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069. Applicant is seen as having combined agents with known utility in fungicidal compositions to make a fungicidal composition.

Applicant appears to argue against the obviousness rejection as if it were an anticipation rejection. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent

prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site <http://www.uspto.gov> in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

No unobvious or unexpected results are noted; no claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Mark Clardy whose telephone number is 571-272-0611. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



S. Mark Clardy  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1617

May 16, 2005